

# COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE **MEMORANDUM**

TO:

**Board of County Commissioners** 

THROUGH: Stephen P. Lee, Deputy County Attorney

FROM:

Henry M. Brown, Assistant County Attorney HMB

Ext. 5736

CONCUR:

Pam Hastings, Administrative Manager/Public Works Department

David V. Nichols, Principal Engineer/Engineering Division

DATE:

April 1, 2005

SUBJECT:

Settlement Authorization

East Lake Mary Boulevard Phase IIB road improvement project

Parcel No. 123; Florida Land Reserve, Inc.

Seminole County v. King, et al. Case No. 99-CA-2431-13-K

This Memorandum requests settlement authorization by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) as to Parcel No. 123 for expert costs in the total sum of \$76,892.86.

#### **PROPERTY** 1

#### A. **Location Data**

Parcel No. 123 is located with frontage on State Road 46 at the State Road 415 intersection. A location map is attached as Exhibit A and a parcel sketch as Exhibit B.

### B. **Street Address**

The street address is 4115 State Road 46 East, Sanford, FL.

#### Ш **AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE**

The BCC adopted Resolution No. 96-R-188 on November 28, 1996, authorizing the acquisition of Parcel No. 123 and finding that the East Lake Mary Boulevard project was necessary, served a public purpose and was in the best interests of the citizens of Seminole County.

### III BACKGROUND

In January, 2005, the case was tried before a jury with full compensation for the value of land determined by a verdict totaling \$286,635.00. The County's trial position was \$151,300.00 and the owner's position was \$510,000.00.

Statutory benefit obtained attorney fees totaled \$38,291.55 based upon a written offer of \$170,000.00.

The jury trial involved land value only subject to apportionment of the land value between the owner, tenant and several lien claimants. The existing business damage claim of the tenant remains unresolved. The business owner and tenant is Aquamarine USA, Inc. The tenant filed for bankruptcy and the automatic stay presently stops the tenant's business damage claim from proceeding.

### IV COST CLAIM

The owner claimed costs totaling \$86,977.07 allocated:

(1)	Planning	\$34,193.82
(2)	Appraisal	\$28,968.75
(3)	Engineering	\$17,537.78
(4)	Court Reporter Charges	\$ 1,612.50
(5)	Exhibit Preparation Costs	\$ 3,778.12
(6)	Witness and Service Fees	\$ 100.60
(7)	Miscellaneous Office Overhead	\$ 785.50

### TOTAL CLAIMED COSTS

\$86,977.07

# V NEGOTIATION

In negotiation, several non-reimbursable office overhead costs were taken out and some expert claims reduced.

Negotiations resulted in a reduction of 11.6% from \$86,977.07 to \$76,892.86. The amounts are allocated as follows:

(1)	Planning	\$30,891.84
(2)	Appraisal	\$26,112.50
(3)	Engineering	\$14,397.30
(4)	Court Reporter Charges	\$ 1,612.50
(5)	Exhibit Preparation Costs	\$ 3,778.12
(6)	Witness and Service Fees	\$ 100.60
(7)	Miscellaneous Office Overhead	\$ 00.00

# TOTAL COSTS REIMBURSEMENTS

\$76,892.86

## VI SETTLEMENT ANALYSIS/COST AVOIDANCE

If this cost matter were taken to hearing, it would be difficult to argue that the costs were unnecessary or excessive because the case actually went to trial and jury verdict.

Additionally, the County would need to employ three experts to review the cost claim and testify as to their reasonableness. Not only would the three experts need to be paid, we cannot say that their testimony would be at lower numbers. With the case having gone to trial, it is not expected that a hearing would reduce costs any greater that the negotiated 11.6%.

# VII RECOMMENDATION

This Office recommends settlement of cost reimbursements at \$76,892.86.

HMB/dre
Attachments:
Exhibit A - Location Map
Exhibit B - Sketch
P:\USERSIDEDGEIMY DOCUMENTS\USERSIDEDGEIMY DOCUMENTS\USE



